

Pamph  
500  
Tariff  
J

Dewart, William  
[Eleven letters on Free Trade vs. Protection, which appeared  
in the Canadian Illustrated News]

MEETING OF THE MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION  
OF ONTARIO HELD IN ST. LAWRENCE HALL,  
TORONTO, NOVEMBER 25, 26, 1875.

-----

The Secretary of the Association was requested to communicate with Mr. William Dewart, of Fenelon Falls, Ontario, and secure, if possible, his consent to publish in connection with the proceedings of this Convention his articles appearing in the "Montreal Illustrated News" on "Protection for Canada." The Secretary having secured the consent of Mr. Dewart, his letters appear in this pamphlet.

-----

Property of -  
Robert Dewart,  
41 Alliance Ave.,  
Rochester, N. Y.

317058  
1-7-35

I ha  
of the  
Manufact  
W. Bane  
WILB  
W. BE  
RO. M  
W.  
JOHN

Some  
Ontario,  
the 25th  
depressio  
healthy  
parts of  
assemble  
Among  
Wilby, J  
Wilby, I  
Cowan,  
Benjamin  
A. K. I  
Sutherla  
Toronto

## Manufacturers' Association of Ontario.

---

TORONTO, ONT., *December 3rd., 1875.*

I have the honour to transmit for your information a Copy of the Preamble and Resolutions passed at a meeting of the Manufacturers' Association of Ontario, held in this City on the 26th of November.

I have the honour to be,

Your obedient servant,

W. H. FRAZER,

*Secretary.*

---

Some weeks ago a circular was issued to the manufacturers of Ontario, asking them to meet in St. Lawrence Hall, Toronto, on the 25th of November, to take into consideration the present depression in trade, and the best means necessary to restore it to a healthy state. Accordingly, a large number of gentlemen from all parts of the Province and some from distant parts of the Dominion, assembled at the place named, yesterday morning at eleven o'clock. Among the manufacturers present were :—Messrs. H. T. Smith, E. Wilby, James Morrison, John Cape, John Fensom, F. E. Dixon, O. Wilby, Hugh Bain, Robert Bain, A. Dredge, C. H. Warren, R. L. Cowan, J. S. McMurray, W. L. Matthews, Robert Barber, jr., Benjamin Lyman, W. H. Howland, William Wrigley, John Turner, A. K. Lauder, Thomas Saunders (of J. and J. Taylor), R. W. Sutherland, John Ritchie, jr., George B. Stock, E. Gurney, jr., of Toronto ; L. H. Brooks, Stephen King, J. H. Davis, H. Burkholder,

Wm. Edgar, James McArthur, Wm. Burrows, J. N. Tarbox, S. E. Townsend, and A. Jamieson, of Hamilton; George Moorehead, London; John Wardlaw, Wm. Young, J. G. Mowat, Robert Scott, Galt; Robt. McKechnie, Dundas; Wm. Barber, Robert Barber, senr., J. S. Statten, Streetsville; William Bell, Wm. Wilkie, John Jackson, Guelph; J. Riorden and R. H. Smith, St. Catharines; S. B. Bradshaw, J. McClung, W. H. Horsey, Bowmanville; John R. Barber, Georgetown; Thomas Ambrose, William Craig, J. G. King, Port Hope; A. S. Whiting, W. T. Cowan, Oshawa; Young, McNoughton & Co., and A. T. Higginson, Montreal; H. Farrington, Norwich; J. Booth, Port Dover; Geo. Smith, Weston; E. R. Shorey, Napan; W. Ramsay, Orillia; James Smart, Brockville; B. Rosamond, Rosamond, Almonte; N. F. Brown, Whitby; John Ross, Norval; T. Desponsa, Springfield; Robert Waugh, Ancaster; Robinson & Robertson, Harriston; Waite & Dolan, Merriton. There were also present during the day Mr. John Macdonald, M. P.; Hon. J. B. Robinson, M. P.; Mr. Samuel Platt, M. P.; Professor Goldwin Smith, Mr. W. A. Foster and Mr. F. C. Capreol, of Toronto; Mr. A. T. Wood, M. P. and Mr. Æ. Irving, M. P., Hamilton; and Mr. W. A. Thompson, M. P., Welland.

#### ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN.

On motion of Mr. B. LYMAN, Mr. W. H. Howland was elected Chairman of the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN made a few remarks expressive of his sense of the honour of being elected to so important a position, and hoped all the proceedings would be conducted without party or political feeling, and without exaggeration, and solely from a business point of view.

#### APPOINTMENTS OF COMMITTEES.

The following standing committees were then appointed:—

*Resolutions and Order of Business*—Messrs. Booth, Smart, Staunton, W. Bell, Rosamond, J. R. Barber, T. B. Bickle, W. Barber, C. H. Warren, E. C. Jones, E. Gurney, B. Lyman, Lavignay, and S. R. Michen.

*Finance and Organization*—Wm. Mickers, R. H. Smith, John Riorden, S. B. Bradshaw, A. Elliott, T. N. Gibbs, W. Craig, Irving, and L. H. Brooks.

The meeting then adjourned till the afternoon.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

Mr. HOWLAND took the chair at about three o'clock. On doing so, he said he was sure they had all felt, since the last meeting of manufacturers, that there had been a great change of opinion

The

JAMES W

B. LYMAN

M. STAUN

JOHN GO

JOHN TU

W. H. HO

W. B. HA

R. W. EL

JOHN MC

R. M. WA

W. E. SA

— WILK

W. BELL

GEO. MOO

J. WATER

JOHN RIO

R. H. SM

ALEX. AR

W. COWA

W. MAC

ANDREW

— MCKE

ROBERT

JOHN AB

WM. HAM

THOS. LA

GEO. BOO

JOHN R. I

THOS. MU

O. WILBY

R. HAY, E

J. IRWIN,

# The Manufacturers' Association of Ontario.

## OFFICERS FOR 1875.

### PRESIDENT.

JAMES WATSON, Esq. .... Knitted Goods.....Hamilton.

### 1st VICE-PRESIDENT.

B. LYMAN, Esq. .... Messrs. Lyman Bros.....Chemicals .....Toronto.

### 2nd VICE-PRESIDENT.

M. STAUNTON, Esq. .... Messrs. M. Staunton & Co.....Paper Stainers.....Toronto.

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

JOHN GORDON, Esq. .... Messrs. Gordon & Mackay.....Cotton Mills.....Toronto.  
 JOHN TURNER, Esq. .... " John Turner & Co.....Boots and Shoes..... "  
 W. H. HOWLAND, Esq. .... " Howland & Son.....Hardware..... "  
 W. B. HAMILTON, Esq. .... " Boots and Shoes..... "  
 R. W. ELLIOT, Esq. .... " Elliot & Co.....Chemicals..... "  
 JOHN MCPHERSON, Esq. .... " John McPherson & Co. Boots and Shoes..... Hamilton.  
 R. M. WANZER, Esq. .... " R. M. Wanzer & Co.....Sewing Machines..... "  
 W. E. SANFORD, Esq. .... " Sanford, Bickley & Vail Clothing..... "  
 - WILKIE, Esq. .... " Wilkie & Osborn.....Sewing Machines.....Guelph.  
 W. BELL, Esq. .... " W. Bell & Co.....Organs..... "  
 GEO. MOOREHEAD, Esq. .... Moorehead Manufacturing Co.....Furniture.....London.  
 J. WATERMAN, Esq. .... Messrs. Waterman & Bro.....Oil..... "  
 JOHN RIORDAN, Esq. .... " Manufr. of Paper.....St. Catharines  
 R. H. SMITH, Esq. .... " Manufr. of Saws..... "  
 ALEX. ARMITAGE, Esq. .... Merchants' Salt Co.....Salt.....Seaforth.  
 W. COWAN, Esq. .... Whiting Manufacturing Co.....Edge Tools.....Oshawa.  
 W. MAC'ULLOUGH, Esq. .... W. McCullough & Son.....Saddle Trees.....Brockville.  
 ANDREW ELLIOT, Esq. .... Elliot, Routh & Sheard.....Woollens.....Almonte.  
 - McKECHNIE, Esq. .... McKechnie & Bertram.....Machinery.....Dundas.  
 ROBERT BARBER, Esq. .... Barber Bros.....Woollens.....Streetsville.  
 JOHN ABELL, Esq. .... " Agricult'l Implem'ts Woodbridge.  
 WM. HAMILTON, Jr., Esq. .... W. Hamilton & Son.....Machinery.....Toronto.  
 THOS. LAILEY, Esq. .... Thos. Lailey & Co.....Clothing..... "  
 GEO. BOOTH, Esq. .... Booth & Son.....Brass Foundry..... "  
 JOHN R. BARBER, Esq. .... W. Barber & Bro.....Paper.....Georgetown.  
 THOS. MEIR, Esq. .... London Car Manfr. Co.....London.  
 O. WILBY, Esq. .... Smith & Wilby.....Woollens.....Toronto.  
 R. HAY, Esq. .... R. Hay & Co.....Furniture..... "  
 J. IRWIN, Esq. .... Irwin & Marshall.....Machinery..... "

### TREASURER.

EDWARD GURNEY, Jun. .... Toronto.

### SOLICITORS.

Messrs. HARRISON, OSLER & MOSS.....Toronto.

### CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

W. H. FRAZER.....Toronto.

### RECORDING SECRETARY.

JOHN MACLEAN.....Toronto.

OFFICE—37 SCOTT STREET, TORONTO, ONT.



Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was present at a concert of the Montreal Workingmen's Mutual Benefit Society last evening, and in an address to the audience attributed the depression to natural causes.

#### IMPORTING AMERICAN CALICOES. 1877

Samples of calicoes woven in America are being offered, says the *Liverpool Courier*, to large drapery houses in London at rather lower prices than the Lancashire market can be bought for. The quality is considered generally to be quite equal to the home-made calicoes. *mail Dec 18*

#### DEATH.

The *Graphic* says:—For the last half century the chief ambition of savage nations has been to obtain modern weapons and "fixed ammunition," and chiefs both on this continent and in the East have granted to their subjects personal privileges and immunities as a premium for getting the best arms. The result of this is that the Turks are now armed with New Haven and New Jersey powder; the Sioux are armed with Remington rifles; Abyssinians use Manchester weapons to slaughter an English detachment, and the Caffres drive their Dutch conquerors down the mountains with breech-loaders which those same Dutch brought to Africa and sold to them for five times their value.

#### NORMAL SCHOOL.

*Dec 18* 77

London Iron on the 24th ult. in an article on the depression in the iron trade in England says "all hope of the iron rail trade has been given up," and, "the castings trade is no better, light castings from the United States being imported into Staffordshire in increasing quantities." It adds "local iron masters declare that the local trade of Sheffield has not been in such an unsatisfactory condition as at present since 1845. Many of the mills are standing still, and more than half of the blast-furnaces are out." The *British Mercantile Gazette* of the same date says:—"In Australia and New Zealand the United States houses, we are assured, are carrying all before them, and at the present rate of progress it will evidently not be many years before these splendid and expanding markets are entirely lost to the manufacturers and merchants of the old country." And yet Free Trade builds up while Protection crushes out manufacturing industries! O, vain and foolish doctrine! *mail*

#### HAMILTON.

*Dec 18* 77

From Our Own Correspondent.]

#### THROWING OFF THE MASK.

HAMILTON, Dec. 14.—For a while the *Times* professed to be in favour of Protection to home manufactures, though denouncing Protection to agriculture as something monstrous and impracticable. This compromise between Protection and the Mackenzie Government was but a hypocritical homage to the farmer, and did not really impose upon anybody here, because everybody knew that the pretended advocacy of Protection was all a pretence on the part of the *Times*. At last the mask is thrown off, however, and the Hamilton apologist of our "fly-on-the-wheel" Government no longer makes the pretence, even, of advocating any kind of Protection at all. Of late it has taken to publishing items calculated to show that Canadian industries are all so prosperous that nothing of the kind is needed—that it would be, in fact, entirely superfluous. To-day it attacks leading Protectionists in Hamilton, among others, Mr. Edward Gurney, a life-long Reformer, who it is suspected has got tired of supporting a Government that refuses to give the country the most needful of all reforms. Understanding that Messrs. McInnes and Gurney have called a meeting of manufacturers here to choose a delegate to the Dominion Board of Trade, the *Times* tells them that they have no power to send a delegate, and sneeringly asks whether Mr. Gurney is an example of a manufacturer ruined for want of Protection. It is well that the pretence so long kept up has been dropped at last, and that the Free Trade organ here is now out in its true colours.

77  
h ult. in an  
the iron trade  
of the iron rail  
d, "the cast-  
castings from  
imported into  
quantities." It  
declare that the  
not been in  
tion as at pres-  
hills are stand-  
f of the blast-  
ish Mercantile  
rs:—"In Aus-  
United States  
carrying all bo-  
t rate of pro-  
e many years  
xpanding mar-  
manufacturers  
untry." And  
ile Protection  
industries! O,

ad  
1877

MASK.

a while the  
our of Protec-  
s, though de-  
agriculture as  
impracticable.  
rotection and  
t was but a  
armer, and did  
dy here, be-  
the pretended  
ll a pretence  
At last the  
ver, and the  
"fly-on-the-  
ger makes the  
any kind of  
has taken to  
o show that  
so prosperous  
ceeded—that it  
superfluous.  
rotectionists in  
Mr. Edward  
who it is  
supporting a  
ive the coun-  
forms. Un-  
McInnes and  
of manufac-  
egate to the  
Times tells  
to send a  
whether Mr.  
manufacturer  
It is well  
t up has been  
Free Trade  
ue colours.

Mo  
adventu  
now, the  
diate a  
everywh  
trade p  
manufa

Th  
They, t  
immedi  
cheapes  
thus un  
country  
shoots  
measur  
*gratific*  
cession  
main m  
measur  
who ha

It  
in man  
hibited  
manufa  
from  
world.  
market  
ever ha  
that sh  
cloth.  
made a  
wool, f  
Wealth

At  
article  
the co  
greate  
Trade  
develo  
that t  
expect  
case w  
stage,



## LETTERS.

## Letter 1.

## FREE TRADE ECONOMY.

*From the CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS, May 30, 1874.*

Most persons have read or heard of Whang, the Miller. The story of his adventure and misfortune will never cease to be interesting. Were he living now, there is no doubt he would be a Free-Trader. Present gratification, immediate and large profit, his ruling passion, is the ruling passion of free-traders everywhere. Economists of this school are ever dreaming of treasures in free-trade pans, and, like Whang, if allowed, would keep on digging until home manufactures would tumble down in ruins.

The Southern planters were Whang the Miller economists and politicians. They, too, dreamed of treasures in Free-Trade pans. They aimed at securing immediate and large profits; they sold in the dearest markets and bought in the cheapest; they despised the profits and occupations of home manufacturers; thus undermining their mills and workshops, till war made their once opulent country one vast scene of suffering and desolation. In wars and sieges, famine shoots harder than cannon. But if people see no immediate danger in a measure, they care little about its effects in the future. This an age of *present gratification*; patriotism, economy, and the public safety make important concessions the ruling passion. Present danger and *present gratification* are the main motives which move the multitude. The opportunities afforded by such measures as Free-Trade, for *present gratification*, are seldom resisted by people who have once formed luxurious tastes.

It was by protection that England overtook nations that once excelled her in manufactures. She not only levied high duties on imported goods, but prohibited the export of raw material by severe penalties. She gave the home manufacturers control of the home market in the most complete manner, till from this solid basis they have successfully invaded every country in the world. Not only this, the competition of the home manufacturers in the home market, reduced the price of goods to the British people lower than they could ever have been procured by free-trade. So far was the protective system carried that she would neither sell English wool to foreign manufacturers nor buy their cloth. In the early stages of English manufactures the exportation of wool was made a felony by the common law. The owner of a ship, knowingly exporting wool, forfeited "all his interest in the ship and furniture." See Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, vol. 2 and pages 494, 495, and 496.

According to Free-Trade theories, this kind of restriction, on the export of an article, would cause its production to cease, or, at least, decline very much. But the contrary is the case. England is, and has been for a long time, one of the greatest wool producing and wool manufacturing countries in the world,—Free-Trade did not make British manufactures what they are; but found them fully developed, excelling everything else in the world, therefore it cannot be said that their success is due to it. If we copy British commercial policy at all, expecting to attain the same results, we must copy it in all its stages, in which case we will find, the stage of English history corresponding with our present stage, affording great protection to home manufacturers.

If we examine the history of the United States, which, as a new country, somewhat resembles our own, we will find it divided into periods of Free-Trade and protection. During a period of protection, the government paid off the debt of the Revolutionary war, and built up considerable home manufactures. Then came a period of Free-Trade, which drained the country of specie, ruined the manufactures, and ended in a great commercial crisis. Each period of Free-Trade and protection, since that time, has produced a similar result. What is protection doing for the States now? Last year American manufacturers were sending machinery to Ireland; and English merchants complained that Americans were underselling them two dollars per ton on iron. The time is coming when the British Government may have to throw around their manufacturers the shield of protection once more. The present contention between workmen and masters may bring about a crisis in the manufacturing interests of England which will put their Free-Trade principles to the test. Men talk bravely when danger is far off. So it is with British Free-Traders while they know their own manufactures are an overmatch for foreigners. But let the British markets be flooded with foreign goods, let British manufacturers be ruined, let the country be drained of specie, and see how long they will hold to their free-trade principles. This state of things would bring about as vigorous protection as ever. Free-Trade is an advantage to England now, but it was not so, or considered so, till it was seen that British manufacturers were an overmatch for foreigners.

Unnecessary dependence is a bad thing. The individual or nation that is depending, more than ordinarily, on others for any essential condition or prosperity, is ever in great danger. Such a condition is not favourable either to the increase of wealth or to the preservation of liberty.

The increase in the tariff, asked of the Government by Canadian manufacturers, would not be a tax, but an investment in home manufactures by the people, which would return to them with a large profit in a very short time. Government bonuses to railways correspond exactly with the principle of protection to home manufactures. Free-Traders say, "Let us do without home manufactures till they become sufficiently profitable to exist without protection." How would it suit to say, "Let us do without railways till they become sufficiently profitable to pay without Government or municipal aid." Trade can be left free in England for the same reason that railways can be built there without such aid as is usually required in this country. Comparison between England and Canada holds good in very few cases, and least of all in their trade relations. We aid railways by bonuses in order to bring producers and consumers into closer relations with each other; and protection to home industry has precisely the same effect.

W. DEWART.

## Letter 2.

### FALLACIES OF FREE TRADE.

*From the CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS, July 13, 1874.*

To the unthinking mind there is a charm in the word "free." What is free in one sense may be very costly and dangerous in other senses. As familiarity is said to beget contempt, so freedom is very liable to degenerate into folly. What is called Free-Trade might be called *foolish-trade* with a great deal more propriety. It is bad economy. It looks only to immediate saving or profit; and nothing is well done in which this is the main motive. Immediate saving or profit causes the farmer to crop without manuring his land. Immediate saving or profit causes the consumer to buy and use inferior articles. In both cases,

new country,  
of Free-Trade  
not paid off the  
manufactures.  
specie, ruined  
Each period  
had a similar  
year American  
merchants com-  
mon on iron.  
throw around  
sent contention  
manufacturing  
the test. Men  
orders while they  
s. But let the  
manufacturers be  
they will hold to  
out as vigorous  
but it was not  
were an over-

nation that is  
condition or pros-  
perable either to

adian manufac-  
turers by the  
very short time.  
principle of pro-  
tection home manu-  
factures without  
protection." They  
become suffi-  
cient. Trade can be  
done there without  
between England  
trade relations.  
consumers into  
has precisely

EWART.

874.

What is free-  
trade? As familiarity  
brings into folly,  
great deal more  
of profit; and  
mediate saving or  
mediate saving  
in both cases.

however, it is well known that the saving, in the first instance, is more than compensated by the loss in the end.

We spend money to make money. Little is ever made otherwise. When we increase the duties on imports, to bring about a permanent reduction in the price of home manufactures, this is our motive. It is not partiality to home manufacturers, as a class; but foresight and self interest which cause us to do so.

Protection is foresight. It is simply looking at the question in all its bearings, from beginning to end. Free-trade principles correspond exactly with certain customs of barbarous tribes and nations. Persons who from age or other illness, for the time being, are unable to keep up with the rest of the tribe in their journeys or migrations, are left behind and allowed to perish. So it is with Free-Traders: an industry, however useful, which is temporarily unable to compete with older and stronger industries, is allowed to perish for want of some trifling relief. Each industry or trade for which a nation is adapted should be made to assist all other industries, and they in return should aid in its development. Trades or industries, like individuals, should conform more to the habits of civilized man than to those of the brute creation. For example, if a human being is about to perish, nothing is more common than for another human being to afford him relief. It is otherwise with the brute creation. One beast may starve in the midst of a numerous flock, without another offering to place a mouthful of food within his reach. Free-Trade is an unnatural doctrine and opposed to the higher order of nature's economy. Free-Trade reminds me of the saying—"root, hog or die." It is well known, however, that this advice very seldom holds good. It would not pay. There are times when it is much wiser to afford certain ones a little extra food and care.

Protection shapes the back to the burden. If a man buys a farm, a team, a waggon, a plough, a spade, clears a fallow or drains a field, he increases his immediate liabilities or expenses. This, however, does not increase his poverty, or incapacity for meeting his requirements. With such increased expenses his ways and means for meeting them increase also. Where protection increases the cost of an article to any extent it also increases the purchasing power of consumers to a much greater extent. For example, this country imports thousands of tons of iron annually, while it has iron ore in abundance, and wood for fuel for smelting purposes. At present, getting rid of the wood is an expensive operation in farming; but were the mines being worked it would become a source of profit. Frequent changes in the tariff and the advocacy of Free-Trade principles are what prevent capitalists from engaging in these enterprises. Till a settled protective policy is adopted, all these enterprises will be neglected. If protection tended to withdraw capital from agriculture or other existing industries it would be different; but this is not the case. Where capital or labour is thus drawn, it is from the foreign countries which would have supplied the goods in the absence of protective duties and home manufactures. Thus if we exclude any portion of American manufactures and replace them with home manufactures, the capital and skilled labour required to do so will come from America directly or indirectly. It is only a question with us where our workshops will be. If work will not go to the workshops the workshops will come to it. When J. & P. Coats were prevented by the duties from sending their thread to the States, they simply established a factory there by exporting capital and skilled labour for the purpose. It is the capital and skilled labour of foreign countries we want, not their manufactured goods. It is only by rendering the latter unprofitable that we can get the former. Protection, in a country like this, puts every industry into healthy operation. It brings more emigrants than all the agents Government could employ. Better still, it keeps them here when they come. This is not the case under a Free-Trade policy. Emigrants brought here now, at the public expense, are known to go right over to the States for want of the very conditions which home manufactures would supply. With protection we have work for all classes; with Free-Trade we can employ little more than agricul-

tural labourers. No large stream of emigration will ever set into our shores till we have employment for all classes. The agricultural labourer will follow his mechanical friend. We want a larger home market for our own produce. For this purpose we want emigrants capable of producing what we now import. There are persons in England who oppose emigration. It is not long since Mr. Roebuck, M. P., said in a speech, that he hoped "England's family of children will still cling to her, and that he holds to be a dastard any Englishman who incites them to seek a new home across the sea." Now, every manufacturer in England is naturally opposed to emigration and will be, so long as our tariff permits him to sell his goods here with profit. But raise our tariff, so as to enable home manufacturers to undersell him, and he will immediately come here with both capital and skilled labour. If we want to draw immigration we must also draw the capital which is employing those emigrants where they are now. If that capital comes, emigrants will follow without any effort on our part. On the other hand, if we get the emigrants to come without the capital, we cannot keep them when they are here. Cheap labour is essential to English manufacturers, and for this reason they discourage emigration, especially of the better class of skilled labourers.

W. DEWART.

### Letter 3.

### FREE TRADE PRINCIPLES CONSIDERED.

*From the CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS, July 4, 1874.*

Mr. Disraeli classifies politics and economy under two heads, which he calls "cosmopolitan" and "national." No more distinct line was ever drawn or clearer definition given. These two ideas have contended for the mastery in all ages. The former is the basis of communism, socialism, Free-Trade and free-love. The latter is the basis of private property, the family institution, and real human progress.

Communism, socialism, Free-Trade, and free-love are all embraced in the cosmopolitan idea. From each one of these ideas it is but a single step to any of the rest, in the present state of society. A time may come when some of these ideas could be adopted; a time may come when all might, but to say the least about this question, that time is still very far off. My more immediate object, however, is to show that the present, at all events, is not the time for adopting any of them.

Nations require to be thorough in their progress as well as individuals. Suppose a pupil should skip a rule in arithmetic or grammar to catch up to a higher class, what would be the consequence? It would probably embarrass him at every subsequent step, and cause him to fail entirely at the examination. Now, nations have examinations as well as individuals, and, to succeed, each must skip nothing, must be thorough, must master every rule as it goes along. Otherwise it may exist, but can win no prize. It will belong to the "dragged up" or "down trodden" class just as the interest of its successful rivals dictate. When you see a nation helplessly tossed about you may be sure it has skipped a rule in its national discipline somewhere.

I will now call home manufactures a rule in national discipline. No nation can skip this rule without paying the penalty of defeat in the final examination. No rule in arithmetic is more essential to the thorough comprehension of the subject than home manufactures is to solid national progress. If a nation skips home manufactures in order to overtake a free-trade movement, along with more advanced nations, it will be sure to suffer a crushing defeat in the first contest

for prizes  
any rule  
if you cl

The  
never sa  
at home  
trymen.  
party is  
him to b  
his own

Cos  
opposed  
duty on  
is traito

Let  
without  
and stag

The  
is not  
order, a

The  
parley a  
retires a

politan  
would b  
egotisti  
howeve

Co

Few su  
one sid  
by the

The pr  
one sid  
render

Hence  
recipro  
those v

be tau  
govern  
revolu

follow  
grees

N  
the in  
paltic

variou  
adopt  
would

factor  
munici  
impos

fices

who  
if wa  
the b

did.

for prizes. Let us overtake those ahead of us, by all means, but not by skipping any rule of national discipline or progress. Build up home manufactures, then, if you choose, fall in with Free-Trade movements.

The nation whose affairs are entrusted to men of cosmopolitan ideas is never safe. Cosmopolitanism just amounts to this, "saints abroad and devils at home:" persons who flatter and please strangers but oppress their own countrymen. The cosmopolitan parleys and temporizes with the foe till his own party is surprised and routed. It is a species of vanity, and this vanity leads him to be more solicitous about the good-will of strangers than the interests of his own country.

Cosmopolitanism is also a species of meddlesomeness. It is diametrically opposed to close attention to one's own affairs. They see their own interest and duty only in meddling with other people's business under various pretences. It is traitorous to all nations and useful to none.

Let the nations which are prepared for Free-Trade have it among themselves, without forcing on those which have not yet passed through the preparatory ages and stages necessary to render it safe and profitable.

The advocate of the national policy is "he who provideth for his own." He is not meddlesome. He attends to his own affairs, keeps his own house in order, and avoids entangling alliances with his neighbours.

The advocate of a national policy is usually a safe sentinel. He does not parley and temporize with the enemy in the face of danger, but gives the alarm, retires and puts the country in a state of defence. However well the cosmopolitan may act after hostilities begin, if preparation were left to him there would be no preparation at all. He does not dream of danger. He is very egotistic, and has an exaggerated idea of his power of moral suasion. Usually, however, his moral suasion results in nothing better than ruinous concessions.

Commercial treaties have serious drawbacks with perhaps a few advantages. Few such treaties are ever renewed. At the end there is generally a reaction on one side or other. The consequence is that the artificial state of affairs created by them perish before anything is done for their preservation or continuance. The provisions of a long treaty are likely to press with severity, occasionally, on one side or other. In fact, human foresight lacks the qualities necessary to render the conditions of a long treaty satisfactory to both parties till the end. Hence it is doubtful if more equitable regulations could not be maintained by reciprocal legislation. You take a treaty, as it were, "for better or worse," and to those who deem it "for worse" it feels like a yoke all the time. "Men should be taught as if you taught them not," and it would be well if they could be governed in much the same way. A commercial treaty is sometimes like a revolution in its effects, whereas *Bacon* says, "Men, in their innovations, should follow the example of Time, which innovateth greatly, but quietly, and by degrees scarcely perceived."

Not long ago I noticed an editorial in *The Illustrated News* pointing out the inconsistency of free-trade with the practice now so common, among municipalities, of giving bonuses to encourage the establishment of manufactories in various places. Cities, towns, and villages throughout the whole Dominion are adopting this method to get factories within their corporations. If government would adjust the tariff properly, every village, town, and city would have all the factories needed without a single bonus. The Dominion government and these municipalities are plainly working against each other. Thus what is saved on imported goods is lost in bonuses. While municipalities are making great sacrifices to build up factories, government is legislating for their extinction.

The progress of free-trade is only apparent; like the progress of the pupil who skips a rule to overtake a class. It is doubtful whether Free-Trade England, if wasted and worsted and stripped of a couple of provinces, as France was in the late war, could pay a proportionable indemnity as promptly as the French did. Free-Trade wealth appears greater than protectionist wealth, probably

because it makes a greater show. The wealth of France was underrated and the wealth of England is probably overrated. England being now, in a sense, the banker of the world, strengthens the impression. It is the great centralization of money in London that gives England so much power as she has in the money markets of the world. The borrower and the lender alike look to Lombard street to have their wants supplied.

This arises from the habit of the English people depositing their money more freely in banks than most other people. The deposits in all the banks throughout the Kingdom are sent to London and lent to the bill brokers, the private banks, the great joint stock banks, or the Bank of England. Besides this, all the banks in the Kingdom deposit their reserves in the Bank of England, which bank lends a great part of these reserves to the public. Hence, there is comparatively no idle money in the Kingdom, except the reserve in the Bank of England. The whole accumulated savings of the nation are in London, and nearly always employed in some way. This centralization of money enables capitalists there to aid vast projects in all parts of the world. There is no such centralization of money in Paris or any part of France. The French people do not take to banking and depositing money in banks so freely as the English do.

They have much more confidence in the government even in the most troublous times, than in the bank. Hence, the great wealth of France is little known till some emergency arises such as the payment of the late indemnity.

W. DEWART.

FENELON FALLS.

#### Letter 4.

### LUMBER AND FREE TRADE.

*From the CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS, Aug. 15, 1874.*

Adam Smith says that the capacity of people to produce wealth exceeds the capacity of the worst governments to waste it. This may be the case on an average from century to century, or generation to generation, but there are times at which the waste is fully equal to the accumulation. *Wise legislation is the basis of national prosperity.* The profits of the farmer, the miner or manufacturer, even in the best seasons, may be swept away by unwise expenditures, tariffs or legislation. Take the lumber trade of this country, for example. A single stroke of diplomacy has totally paralyzed it. By one wrong move profits are rendered impracticable. A theory has, however, been tested; but at an enormous cost. This is the application of Free-Trade principles to the lumber business. The present authorities, believing that competition, supply and demand, are all that is necessary to maintain trade in a wholesome state, offered immense timber limits for sale. This, together with giving settlers power to sell their timber at the time when the market was fully supplied, caused a glut resulting in the present crisis. Free-Traders ascribe the depression to the monetary crisis in the States. Now half the truth is usually a lie. This explanation is but part, and a very small part, of the cause. The depression is partly due to that crisis, but principally to bad legislation in this country. Previous to this, while limits were offered for sale sparingly, the trade flourished and made profits. People, like children, often cry for what would make them sick. The lumbermen demanded limits, and the government, like a foolish parent, gave them an overdose. *Hence popular demands require to be tempered with prudence.* The Reformer may be as much too fast as the Conservative is too slow; and the former failing is fraught with much more danger than the latter.



The sale of those limits has stimulated production ever since. Worse still. The capital formerly employed in handling and holding the manufactured lumber was invested in limits, throwing the manufacturers on the more precarious and costly aid of banks. Capital is not unlimited or elastic like the air. It does not move from one trade to another without a *pull*. The *pull* consists in higher interest. There is a certain amount of capital available for each trade, and to draw in more than this requires an effort and sacrifice. Hence, the circulating capital locked up unproductively in those limits had to be replaced, both in Canada and the States, by drawing capital from other industries. The lumberers could draw capital from other industries, to replace that invested in limits, only by offering the banks higher rates of interest than others were giving. Hence, a ruinous competition for all parties commenced, and the bank rates went up to ten per cent. I will not say that the lumber trade was the sole cause of this; but I believe it to be the main cause. The other effect, the glutting of the market, was caused in this way. It is not necessary, for my purpose, to show that the new limits have been yet touched. Their purchase stimulated production on the old limits. Firms investing largely in new limits were obliged to get some of their money back as soon as possible. This was, in many cases, done by increasing the production of the old limits; and so far as glutting the market is concerned, is just as effectual as if the work had been on the new limits. There is something more than supply, demand, and competition required to regulate trade. If left to these alone, manufacturers and traders, like tribes and clans, are liable to exterminate each other. Legislation is the basis of all business success. Business can no more prosper under unwise laws than human life can continue vigorous in a foul atmosphere.

There are rich men in the worst governed countries; but whether the average wealth of people is high or low depends very much on their laws and legislation. Organizations, like that lately formed by the lumbermen, to curtail production, could not be needed under a sound system of commercial legislation. Such a system would lead each individual to pursue the course best for himself and best for society without entering into any organization. *The necessity for organizations proves the existence of great abuses or defects in the law.*

Again, such organizations are nearly always inoperative. No rule can be adopted suitable for all interested. Hence, the result is that one or more break the rule and the rest gradually follow. This is the difficulty attending a combination. There are, also, difficulties in the absence of organization. No mill-owner likes to set the example of curtailment by closing his works. It might affect his credit. People would be liable to think he is getting into financial straits. Rather than send the impression abroad he goes on till ruined. He will not halt while strong, and is ashamed to halt when becoming weak. Besides this, stop when he will, there is another danger. In all such suspensions the workmen are likely to consider the act a device for lowering wages. Such an impression as this once created may endanger both the employers' property and life.

Much will never be accomplished by organization. In fact weak firms will countenance the attempt least. There are two causes for this. First they may want to conceal their weakness by assuming a tone of indifference. Second they may have no way of meeting their liabilities but by keeping in motion even at a loss. To stop and let their fixed capital stand idle may in itself be ruinous. It is only strong firms that are able to do this. Many a man continues a business, and makes a living by it, long after his capital is gone. Under vicious commercial laws such a person cannot recover; but under good laws he may not only recover but afterwards amass wealth. The lumber trade of this country has been partially ruined by the application of Free-Trade principles; and all our manufacturers will be ruined also if that principle, as contained in the proposed Reciprocity Treaty, be carried into effect.

Mismanagement always leads to increased loss, labour and expense. There

is nothing in which this is more apparent than in legislation. The individual can no more escape the effects of bad laws than the effects of a bad climate. The trouble, loss and expense occasioned by the sale of the limits referred to are incalculable. We may possibly have more legislation on the subject, as it is proposed now by free-traders to put an export duty on lumber to check its manufacture. This would be a step from extreme Free-Trade to extreme protection. Lumber is said to be unprofitable now; and they propose to make it profitable by putting new taxes on it.

W. DEWART.

FENELON FALL.

### Letter 8.

### RECIPROCITY IN HARDWARE.

*From the CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS, Jan. 23, 1875.*

It is heavy goods in which home manufacturers first begin to compete with foreigners. These require little skilled labour and a large quantity of raw material. The raw material and the manufactured work being alike heavy, freight on this class of goods affords home manufactures some protection. They can make ploughs before axes, and axes before pen knives. In the manufactures of boots and shoes, for example, this country ceased to import stogies long before women's calf boots, and women's calf boots long before children's boots.

It is not long since these latter were imported in large quantities from Massachusetts; and, notwithstanding the duties always paid, they would still be imported but for the increased taxes caused by the war in the States. The ostensible argument of Free-Traders is that Canadian manufactures can compete with American. I admit they can in some kinds of heavy goods; but the quantity of American manufactures on the shelves of hardware stores in the Dominion show that they cannot do so in light goods. It shows, also, that even English manufacturers cannot stop the importation of American goods into Canada.

Notwithstanding this, Free-Traders tell us that American manufactures are ruined by protection. Take fish hooks, for example. I have been selling fish hooks for thirteen years, and never saw a fish hook made in Canada; though during that time I have seen and sold thousands manufactured in New Haven, Conn. Now, I have no doubt there is a larger per centage on fish hooks than on any article of hardware manufactured in this country. The Americans and English have the best share of our hardware business yet. Most if not all the brass rivets used in Canada are made in the States.

Tire bolts and carriage bolts are imported in large quantities from Philadelphia. Factories for the manufacture of these have been started in different parts of Canada, but as yet, notwithstanding freight, duty, and war taxes, the American manufacturers do a large share of the business. The plough bolts used in this country are extensively made in New York City. Manufacturers of ploughs tell me they never saw a plough bolt made in Canada. Neither did I. Whenever I order plough bolts from a wholesale house, those made in New York are sent.

Butt hinges, especially the small sizes, two inches and under, are imported in large quantities from Providence, Rhode Island. All the gimlets, so far as I can see, and a great many of the auger bits, used in this country, are made in New York City. From the lightness of these goods, in proportion to their value, freight is hardly any protection to our manufactures. Among light goods of this kind, cut tacks is one of the first things in which Canadians have begun

to compet  
have been  
ver, are s  
Spirit  
in Canada  
Whenever  
manufactu  
can drive  
which gav  
the scrato  
Ther  
used in th  
knows, a  
Fairbank  
The  
factories  
formidab  
ruining t  
Stee  
Razors o  
aware of  
chusetts,  
mers is  
the State  
sent thos  
our man  
than cou  
business  
danger  
Canadian  
this desc  
Nothing  
tion con  
their cus  
Wi  
see, but  
were so  
of Cana  
they we  
were so  
manufa  
a part  
Th  
to pro  
erish a  
dian c  
for Am  
the bu  
operat  
or intr  
T  
as che  
goods  
culty.  
offer  
canno  
mark  
Canav

The individual  
of a bad climate,  
limits referred to  
the subject, as it is  
ber to check its  
to extreme pro-  
pose to make it

DEWART.

1875.

to compete with  
ty of raw mater-  
heavy, freight on  
They can make  
atures of boots  
before women's

quantities from  
y would still be  
e States. The  
ures can com-  
goods; but the  
e stores in the  
also, that even  
can goods into

manufactures are  
cn selling fish  
nada; though  
New Haven,  
sh hooks than  
mericans and  
if not all the

from Philadel-  
different parts  
s, the Ameri-  
bolts used in  
ers of ploughs  
id I. When-  
ew York are

are imported  
s, so far as I  
are made in  
tion to their  
g light goods  
have begun

to compete with the Americans. Messrs. Pillow, Hersey & Co., of Montreal, have been manufacturing in large quantities for some time. A good deal, however, are still imported from the States, particularly Abbingdon, Mass.

Spirit levelers are imported from Philadelphia. I have never seen one made in Canada, and am not aware of a factory of the kind being in the country. Whenever I order spirit levelers from a wholesale house I get those of American manufacture. Here, then, are articles in which neither Canadians nor English can drive the American manufacturers from the market; and it is protection which gave them the start necessary to attain this position. Most, if not all, of the scratch awls used in the country are made in the States.

There is no cartridge factory in Canada of which I know: all the cartridges used in this country come from Connecticut and New York. Scales, everyone knows, are largely imported from St. Johnsbury, Vermont, where the famous Fairbanks' factory is.

The protection afforded by the American Government has built up splendid factories of this kind all over the Union, and made American manufacturers formidable all over the globe. Still, Free-Traders tell us that protection is ruining the States. I am inclined to think it is ruining somebody else.

Steel pens manufactured in New Jersey are used extensively in this country. Razors of American manufacture are imported to this country, but I am not aware of any being manufactured here. Shoemaker's awls come from Massachusetts, and the handles from Connecticut. Though the manufacture of hammers is carried out to a large extent here, very many are, still, imported from the States. When I order steel hammers to retail at over a dollar I am usually sent those of American manufacture. Distance or freight, on hammers, afford our manufacturers very little protection. These advantages are much more than counterbalanced by the accumulation of labour, skill and capital where the business has been long established. But let the tariff remain as it is; let the danger of sudden changes cease; and labour, skill and capital will come to Canadian manufacturers in such quantities as will soon enable them to make all this description of goods required, both in respect to price, quality and quantity. Nothing paralyzes industry more than uncertainty. While the Free-Trade agitation continues, Canadian manufacturers cannot calculate, either, who will be their customers or what will be their profits.

With "a market of forty millions" they may be like Moses, permitted to see, but not allowed to enter the promised land. More American cradle scythes were sold here at Fenelon Falls during the last three years than similar scythes of Canadian make. They were no cheaper or better than Canadian goods, but they were imported and purchased by storekeepers here, and had to be sold, and were sold. The farmers who bought them gained nothing, but the American manufacturer made a profit and the Canadian manufacturers were deprived of a part of their legitimate trade.

There is neither patriotism, statesmanship nor policy in theories calculated to produce such results as this. Such a policy must necessarily tend to impoverish a country. Reciprocity would annihilate in one instant millions of Canadian capital. As in the case of the scythes above referred to, it is not necessary for American manufacturers to undersell ours; *they need only to take enough of the business to make the balance unprofitable*. Here is another thing which would operate against Canadian manufacturers: Canadian goods, not being yet known or introduced in the States, agents would have great difficulty in getting orders.

There would be a prejudice against the idea that we could make goods either as cheap or well as old American manufacturers. On the other hand, American goods being long known in this country, agents get orders without much difficulty. To establish a business in the States, our manufacturers would have to offer a better and cheaper article than the American manufacturers, which they cannot do. It is easy to foresee the result. Between the loss of the home market and the delays and difficulties of establishing any business in the States, Canadian manufacturers would be ruined in nine cases out of ten.

Notwithstanding heavy freights on safes, considerable numbers are imported from the States. An agent from Cincinnati took quite a number of orders in Canada not long ago. It is probably with the safes as with the scythes. The purchasers are in no way benefited. But it results in profit to the American manufacturers and loss of legitimate business to the Canadian.

It is natural for Canadians to buy American safes, but not for Yankees to buy Canadian safes, if they were even twice as good as any made in their own country. The "market of forty million" has a great many drawbacks like this.

Steam engines are also imported from the States. Not long ago I saw an agent selling steam engines made in New York city to persons living at Georgian Bay. Axes, once largely imported from the States, are still imported to some extent. A storekeeper at Horse Shoe Bridge, somewhere in the back country south of Lake Nipissing, has American axes advertised for sale. These axes are no cheaper and perhaps not so good as Canadian axes. Their sole result consists in transferring a certain profit from home manufacturers to foreigners.

In the face of these facts, can any person argue that Reciprocity would benefit Canadian manufacturers? Free-Traders know this as well as anyone, but their real spring of action is utter indifference about the success or existence of Canadian manufactures at all. With access to the States, Canadian manufacturers are needed no longer. Perish Home manufacturers, in order that Free Traders' whims may succeed!

The great mass of mankind exercise too little foresight.

Mr. Bagehot, in his able work on Politics, says a desire for instant action constitutes the chief difference between savages and civilized man. It is this desire for instant action in politicians which lead people, step by step, unconsciously to results of which they never dream, till the prevention becomes impossible. I see a man opening a dyke, and tell him the sea will come in. He says, "I will oppose the sea." His opposition will be too late. If he opens the dyke, the sea will enter in spite of him. I hear men demanding Reciprocity, and tell them it will lead to *annexation*. They say "we will oppose annexation." Their opposition will be too late. Annexation will follow Reciprocity in spite of them. "They're sowing the seed," but "what shall the harvest be?"

FENELON FALLS.

W. DEWART.

#### Letter 6.

*From the CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS, Feb. 13, 1875.*

Some articles in the last number of *The Canadian Farmer*, copied from the *Ohio Farmer*, *The Oshawa Vindicator*, and *The Whitby Chronicle*, furnish an excellent argument against Reciprocity in Agricultural Implements.

They show that, so far as real ultimate profit is concerned, the more men "seek it in Free Trade, they leave their views the farther."

The article to which I refer, gives an account of the manufacture of *The Champion Mower and Reaper*, by Messrs. Whitley, Fassler and Keily, of Springfield, Ohio, and Messrs. Joseph Hall and Company, of Oshawa. The factory in Springfield was started about twenty years ago, on a small scale. It made fifty machines the first year; it can make about fifty thousand in the same time now. "CHAMPION REAPERS, from Springfield," says *The Oshawa Vindicator*, "are this year being sent to France, Germany, Prussia, Austria, Poland, Hungary, Denmark, Russia, Egypt, Sweden, England, East Indies, Chili, the Argentine Republic, and Australia."

"Twenty-five hundred machines are being built at Oshawa for the harvest of 1875," in Canada. How does this come?

"Mr. L. H. Lee, who has been connected with the Champion in the States and Europe for the past thirteen years, has come here to reside and take charge of its construction and sale in Canada." Had Free-Traders their way, no Champion Machines would be built at Oshawa; nor would Mr. L. H. Lee come there to reside. He would build the machines at Springfield, and export them to Canada, as he does to other countries.

The duty on these machines has compelled Mr. Whitly, the manager of the Springfield factory to take a share in the Hall works at Oshawa. "The Hall Company," says the *Vindicator*, "not only secures Mr. Whitly's capital, and the exclusive control of his patents and future inventions, but the benefit of his experience, energy, judgment and prestige." This is just what Canada wants. If we have Free-Trade, let it be in *capital, labour, skill and experience*—not in manufactures.

The Joseph Hall Works, in Oshawa, will bring more capital, and desirable emigration into Canada, than some of the emigration agencies maintained by the Government at great expense, in foreign countries. If any person thinks that profits are large in this country, let him come with all the capital he can command, and all the skilled labour he can employ, and share in the general prosperity. This is the legitimate limit of Free-Trade.

This arrangement will have one or two remarkable effects. First, these machines will be built as cheaply at Oshawa, as in Ohio. Hence, the Canadian farmer will buy them cheaper than he would with Reciprocity, because, with Reciprocity they would be built in Ohio, with freight added to their cost, when exported to this country. The farmer saves the freight; hence, here is a case in which duty and protection have actually diminished the cost of a very important article.

Free-Traders will, doubtless, say that Reciprocity would not prevent the machines being made in Oshawa. I say it would. With Reciprocity, Mr. Whitly would not sell his patents to the Hall Company, or any Company in Canada, or give them capital, or send a manager there, or give them the benefit of his experience. He would much rather keep all these things to himself, make the machines at home, export them to Canada, compelling Canadian farmers to pay the freight, as he does with the farmers of England, France, and other countries.

Home manufactures have a very beneficial effect on the currency of a country. Panics in the money market are seldom, if ever, caused by them. Importations have a different effect. They often cause panics, and a severe stringency in the money market. Suppose, for example, that a bank lends a manufacturer ten thousand dollars: he pays a large portion of this to his work people; they pay a large part of what they get for provisions, or village lots, or building houses. Some of what they get may go directly for sugar or tea to the importer; but the most part circulates round the immediate neighbourhood, and returns to the bank. Such loans, while they aid production immensely, do not diminish bank funds very much. It is a very small portion of them for which gold is asked, while the balance—much larger portion—returns to the bank in a short time, and is again available for new advances. The *twenty-five hundred Champion Reapers*, to be made in Oshawa this year, will not diminish the loanable funds of Canadian banks to any appreciable extent; whereas, if made in Ohio, they would diminish those funds to the full extent of the price paid for them.

It is highly important that banks should always have an abundant supply of money, at certain seasons of the year, and this can never be the case, till home manufactures become developed. A scarcity of money, caused by importations, when the crops require to be moved to market, is always a serious loss and inconvenience to the agricultural community. This is a side of the

question never presented to farmers by Free-Traders. They tell them that Reciprocity means twenty cents a bushel on barley, which is not true.

Barley has been as good a price since 1864 as during the ten years of Reciprocity. Free-Traders do not tell farmers that Reciprocity means a scarcity of money when their produce is being moved to market. When a bank lends an importer ten thousand dollars, he takes it in gold, and the loanable funds of the bank are diminished to that extent at once, and during the continuance of the loan.

Supposing the *twenty-five hundred Champion Reapers* wanted were made in the States. When a farmer bought one, the bills which he paid for it are taken to a bank and exchanged for gold, which is taken immediately out of the country. Even where a farmer gives his note for a machine, the note is discounted, and the gold is exported precisely as before. Gold is the basis of our currency, and every dollar exported diminishes the currency to two or three times that amount.

As shown, with regard to the reapers, it is doubtful whether farmers would gain in any particular by Reciprocity, while it is certain they would lose heavily on their grain by a scarcity of money at certain seasons.

Free-Traders continually assert that duty necessarily increases the cost of an article. I think I have, in the case of these machines, shown that it does not, and why it does not. The Free-Trade argument addressed to farmers is: Why should Canadian manufacturers be enriched at your expense? This is a powerful argument, when thus stated, and applied to the selfish side of human nature, without a proper knowledge of all the facts.

A farmer goes to Hall & Co.'s shop to buy a reaper; he takes a look about the establishment, thinks he sees a great many evidences of wealth; concludes, for certain, that Hall & Co. are getting rich at his expense, and decides to vote for the Free-Trade candidate at the next election. This is the effect of Free-Trade fallacies and lectures on him.

Messrs. Whitley, Fassler & Keily, of Springfield, Ohio, have an establishment many times as large as Hall & Co.'s. They export reapers to this country; that farmers buy from them without ever appearing to suspect that *they are getting rich at his expense*. The Free-Traders never told him so, and the idea has not occurred to his own mind. He envies the moderate wealth of the Home Manufacturer, while the much greater wealth of foreign manufacturers does not move his envy at all. This is one of the pernicious effects of Free-Trade agitation.

They are not good men who seek office by arraying class against class, — telling one that others are getting rich at its expense; or instilling such principles as the foregoing into the public mind. Our interests are all identical. As well might the hand say to the foot: "I can do without you," as for Canadian farmers to say: "We can do without Home Manufacturers," without very great loss and inconvenience.

W. DEWART.

FENELON FALLS.

F  
to the  
becom  
require  
in very  
were t  
Engla  
This is  
trous t  
develo  
with th  
and W  
facture  
Duties  
Nation  
debts  
manuf  
triatin  
Free-T  
for all  
It  
France  
teache  
It is o  
every  
would  
fewer  
Nation  
prospe  
possib  
exist.  
erally  
Bisma  
tary j  
weigh  
doubt  
canno  
work.  
of Fre  
mone  
most  
the d  
war a  
suit h  
For t  
war t  
princ  
barba  
of de  
train



## Letter 7.

## FREE TRADE AND ARBITRATION.

*From the CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS, June 27, 1874.*

Free-Trade can hardly ever become universal or continuous. It is opposed to the inevitable necessities of national prosperity. Every time two great nations become involved in war their whole commercial policies with other nations require changes. In some cases the effects of these changes are felt severely in very remote places. The trade relations between England and the States were totally changed by the late civil war. The commercial treaty between England and France was swept away by the late French and Prussian war. This is the fate of every treaty, sooner or later; and such a fate is always disastrous to trade. *Permanent, steady prosperity cannot be secured without a large development of home manufactures.* If Canada now enters into trade relations with the States, *to the injury of home manufactures*, a war between the East and West, of which there is some real danger, will again find us without manufactures of our own, and compelled to pay war prices for everything we import. Duties and taxes are, and will always be, the only means of paying war debts. Nations, not having home manufactures, are constantly assisting to pay the debts of other nations. As shown in a former letter, England built up home manufactures by protection; till now, nearly every nation in the world is contributing toward the payment of her national debt. Protection is what makes Free-Trade ultimately profitable. Free-Trade, however, can never be profitable for all. It is only so for those who possess natural or acquired advantages.

It is no use to preach Free-Trade to a nation in the present position of France, or in that of the States immediately after the civil war. Adversity teaches those people to reject such nonsense. *True economy is learned in adversity.* It is only in prosperous times that false theories like Free-Trade take root. In every financial embarrassment nations have to flee to protection; and if people would not forget the arts by which they surmount difficulties, they would make fewer mistakes. The way to pay debts and the way to make money is the same. Nations pay debts by duties and protection to home manufactures; to continue prosperous, it is necessary to continue this policy. The conditions that might possibly make Free-Trade safe and profitable do not exist, and are never likely to exist. For example, the idea that international disputes are about to be generally settled by arbitration is nonsense. Such men as Emperor William and Bismarck, backed by immense resources, after enormous expenditures in military preparations, feeling strong and confident of victory, will never submit a weighty matter to arbitration where the decision of such a tribunal is at all doubtful. Military men have no faith in such a prediction. Krupp, the great cannon manufacturer in Prussia, is putting \$7,500,000 of new capital into his work. All these things point to a continuance of war, as usual, and the unfitness of Free-Trade theories at present. Capitalists are as willing as ever to furnish money to carry on war, and invest money in the manufacture of arms. The most gigantic warlike preparations are going on on every side. England, where the doctrine of arbitration finds its chief support, is building as many ships of war as ever. It was by war she won her vast dominions, though peace would suit her best now; but younger nations are not yet satisfied to give the game up. For those who give attention to the subject, there is more to be gained yet by war than by arbitration. The age is still far off when war will cease to be the principal arbiter between nations. There are too many barbarous and semi-barbarous nations still in the world for civilized man to lay down the only means of defence which holds such people in awe. As the pugilist requires the blows of a training master to prepare him for the real conflict, so one civilized nation still

requires to come into collision with another to prepare them for a conflict with the barbarous nations by which a great portion of the earth is still inhabited. If the master of the world, at the present day, it is his superiority in arms which has made him so. Our intercourse with half the world and a large majority of the human race is preserved only by our superiority in the use of arms. If Europe and America abandoned warlike preparations, and adopted rules for settling international disputes by arbitration, both countries would be conquered by the barbarous and semi-barbarous hordes of Asia and Africa within two centuries. To civilized man, war is an evil; but the abandonment of the art, as advocated by the arbitration movement, would be a greater evil. In wars between civilized nations, civilization suffers little in comparison with what it suffers when a civilized nation is conquered by a barbarous one. This is where the screw is loose in the Free-Trade movement. Free-traders think that arbitration as a means of settling nearly all international disputes is an accomplished fact; and that any policy which the present civilized nations think proper to adopt will control the destinies of mankind in all time to come. This kind of egotism is common in all ages. Greece, Rome, Persia, Assyria, and all the nations of antiquity, thought the same thing of themselves. They never dreamed that the seat of power would be in Western Europe some day; just as the free-traders of Western Europe now think it will never remove to any place else hereafter.

Should any considerable declension take place in the military art in Western Europe, the British army might probably be driven out of India within fifty years. Were it not for modern improvement in the manufacture of fire-arms, I doubt if the Government could hold India even now. With the old musket, British soldiers could hardly succeed in expeditions even against such enemies as the Abyssinians or Ashantees; and repulses in cases of this kind might lead to the invasion of Europe by Asia or Africa once more. However improbable this may appear at present, it might be rendered quite practicable by the operation of such principles as Free-Trade and the settlement of international disputes by arbitration.

The arbitration and Free-Trade doctrines emanate from the same source. Free-Trade economists are the blindest of all politicians, and those who elevate such men are the blindest of all electors. They remind one of the man who in lopping the branches off a tree cut the one on which he was standing. The declension of the military art, likely to arise from arbitration, would efface civilization on two continents, and exclude the manufactures of Western Europe from half of the human race.

To each civilized nation individually there is no more important question than protection to home manufactures; and to all civilized nations collectively there is nothing of greater consequence than progress in the art of war. While the former confines the evil effects of war pretty much to its immediate locality, the latter is required to push forward civilization in barbarous countries. Disarming civilized nations is equivalent to arming barbarous ones. But the practice of modern philanthropists is to disarm everything good and leave everything bad armed to the teeth. They are silly enough to suppose that if the saint lays down his sword Satan will follow the example. The ballot bill just passed is a corresponding principle. By it, law and public opinion, the highest emanations of public virtue, are totally disarmed, while every elector is placed in a position to bribe or be bribed with impunity.

FENELON FALLS.

W. DEWART.

"PRO

T  
Trade  
humb  
Trade  
asking  
Neith  
a man  
is fol  
duce  
other.  
sugar,  
where  
says:  
with r  
produc  
instea

A  
trade f  
of Cal  
between  
and, fo  
Califor  
Canad  
ferent  
on Cal  
each is  
either  
tude o  
folly o  
to the  
more s  
if he  
tionist

N  
which  
strictly  
a nati  
entirel  
They  
unques  
someth

T  
lose fo  
everyth  
the neg  
till que  
tionist

## Letter 8.

**"PROTECTION IS THE FOLLY OF ASKING A MAN TO MAKE  
ALL HIS OWN CLOTHES."**

*From the CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS, Jan. 2, 1875.*

The foregoing quotation is one of the many sophisms employed by Free-Traders. It is the style of argument used by all that class, from Mr. Bright to his humblest followers. Professor Price, who is claimed as an advocate of Free-Trade, is reported to have said in one of his lectures, "Protection is the folly of asking a man to make all his own clothes." This is a misrepresentation. Neither Horace Greeley, Morrill, nor any living protectionist writer, ever asked a man, or even a nation, to do any such thing. Again, the Professor says, "It is folly to foster 'home industry,' by requiring the people of the country to produce *everything* they want." This statement is worse, if anything, than the other. It means that protectionists recommend producing their own silk, tea, sugar, spices, and so forth, in whatever climate they live. I would like to know where the Professor met with men advocating these opinions. Further on he says: "Nations, like individuals, have special facilities, faculties and aptitudes, with respect to production." This is what we perceive, and we ask nations to produce those things for which they have "special facilities and aptitudes," instead of importing them from other countries.

Again, "nobody ventures to maintain that the people of Maine should not trade freely with the people of Texas; the people of New York with the people of California." He gives this as his reason why there should be Free-Trade between Canada and the States. The Professor appears to forget one thing, and, forgetting this, he falls into a very grave error. The relations of Maine, California, Texas and New York to each other are different from the relations of Canada to any of them. Canada is under a different government, and has different interest, both commercially and politically. For Maine to be dependent on California, or California on Maine, does not affect the safety of either, for each is pledged to the defence of the other; but for Canada to be dependent on either is perilous, neither being pledged to her defence, but occupying the attitude of interested enemies. One quotation more from the Professor, "The folly of compelling *everybody* to make all his own clothes will soon be relegated to the shades that envelope the old Navigation Act of Great Britain." There is more sound than sense in this quotation. The Professor is a very ignorant man if he does not know that his recommendation has been adopted, by Protectionists as well as free-traders, long before the repeal of the Navigation Act.

Nothing leads to more frequent errors in reasoning than comparing things which are not comparable. The Professor asserts something of a man which is strictly true, so long as affirmed of a man, but utterly erroneous when applied to a nation. The acceptance of Free-Trade principles by the public depends entirely on the capacity of the leaders to mix, confuse and mystify the matter. They require to be kept to the point, like the Professor. When they make unquestioned assertions, don't allow them to transfer or apply the conclusions to something dissimilar.

The moment free-traders state the exact idea intended their arguments lose force. Had the Professor said, "It is a folly to ask a nation to produce everything it requires, for which it has natural facilities," he would have stated the negative of protection fairly and clearly. But the other form of expression, till questioned, answers his purpose better. J. S. Mill admits all that protectionists affirm, when he says that "any country having natural facilities for any

particular manufacture is justified in adopting protection for a time to give the start which otherwise individual enterprise alone would not be able to make."

"The start" above referred to is all that Canadian manufacturers ask. But free-traders are too cosmopolitan in their ideas to give their own countrymen even this small preference over foreigners. They contend that if a country has natural facilities its manufactures need no start. Mill thinks otherwise; he recommends protection *for a time*, even where the facilities exist.

W. DEWART.

FENELON FALLS.

---

Letter 9.

"A MARKET OF FORTY MILLIONS."

*From the CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS, Jan. 9, 1875.*

The foregoing quotation is one of the cunningly devised fallacies of free-traders in behalf of Reciprocity. It would be to the States, in many respects, a market of four millions, but never to Canada "a market of forty." In proportion to the population, the Americans are our customers to a limited extent, but our competitors to a large extent. The same rule holds good regarding their trade with England; while becoming less valuable customers, they are becoming more formidable competitors.

As shown by Mr. Mathews, in his work on "Imperial Federation," the imports of the States, from England, have been decreasing ever since their independence. While colonists they imported goods to the amount of £1 per head per annum; immediately after independence the rate declined to 16s. per head per annum; and in 1861 it was no more than 5s. 9d. per head per annum. This change was affected by the adoption of a protectionist policy after separation. American manufacturers have now not only excluded English goods, in a great measure, from their markets, but are supplying Canada with many articles formerly imported from England. Had the American manufacturers not been protected thus they could never have attained this position. Protection has made them the most formidable rivals England has, or is likely to have, in the future. It is only by accepting a theory without examining the facts, that a person can arrive at a different conclusion from the above.

To the States bordering on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence our exports may be considerable, but to the *great majority of the forty millions* we would never sell an article, for the simple reason that they produce and manufacture the same kind of commodities as we do. What do the Southern States want of Canada? They don't want our manufactures, because they can be supplied more cheaply and conveniently by the intervening States. It is not possible that they can become great customers of ours.

They don't want our lumber. There is more and better lumber in the Southern States than there is in Quebec or Ontario. It is distance, absence of railways, canals and navigable rivers which prevent the Eastern States from getting Southern lumber now. The unsettled state of the country is retarding the construction of railways and canals. The rivers run in the wrong direction

me to give the  
le to make."  
urers ask. But  
yn countrymen  
a country has  
otherwise; he

EWART.

875.

allacies of free-  
many respects, a  
y." In propor-  
limited extent,  
regarding their  
y are becoming

"ederation," the  
since their inde-  
of £1 per head  
o 16s. per head  
r annum. This  
after separation.  
oods, in a great  
many articles  
cturers not been  
Protection has  
to have, in the  
he facts, that a

ence our exports  
tions we would  
and manufacture  
ern States want  
can be supplied  
ot possible that

lumber in the  
nce, absence of  
ern States from  
try is retarding  
wrong direction

for this pu  
Canadian  
settled like

ideal of every southern planter.

Twenty thousand acres of forest, with two or three thousand acres of a cleared farm was the style. A planter's farm was like a small village. Pass one, and you usually travel through miles of unbroken forest before coming to another human habitation. The Southern States will have plenty of timber long after Quebec or Ontario has a stick to export. Thus we see no market in the South for Canadian lumber, neither is there any in the West. Parts of Ontario import lumber from the States; and about one-half of the lumber made in Michigan finds a market in New York.

Thus we see this "market of forty millions" dwindle down to the partial supply of a narrow strip of country south of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence. The privilege is entirely overrated by the advocates of Reciprocity. It is not worth the Fisheries by any means. Persons who forget that the Americans are our competitors, in a much greater degree than our customers, fall into many mistakes. As a market for our wheat, this part of the argument is easily disposed of. Much of the wheat exported to the States does Canada an ultimate injury.

For example, it is ground with their dark wheat, and the flour thus made comes into competition with our wheat and flour in the English market. Were they not to get our wheat for this purpose, their wheat would be unfit for export, or have to be exported at a reduced rate. The Americans produce much more wheat than they consume, and imports from this country simply swell their exports in precisely the same ratio. If my competitor orders an article from me for a person who is occasionally my customer as well as his, I am no better off than if he had allowed the customer to have come to me directly for the article himself. In fact, I am worse off; persons who buy to sell again are accustomed to a margin called trade discount. Selling direct to the consumer is like buying direct from the manufacturer; these are the transactions in which there is most profit. England is our chief customer for wheat, and seeing this, direct exports secure the largest ultimate profit.

To place our commerce on a profitable and durable basis, we must resort to direct trade by outlets of our own. The proposed Reciprocity Treaty would be an entangling alliance, which might lead to very undesirable results. With Canada, free trade is the forerunner of annexation. It is said that the treaty of 1854 did not lead to this. There was a good reason for it. The South seceded in time to check the demand and prevent the catastrophe. Another secession might not occur, at the proper time, to save us from similar danger.

The termination of a treaty is a delicate question, when the notice proceeds from the weaker party. Had Canada been obliged to give the notice in 1864, in the temper of the American people at that time, it might have led to hostilities. Here then is the danger. If a treaty is objectionable to the States, they can withdraw at its expiration without ceremony or fear. On the other hand, if it is objectionable to us, withdrawing may be made an excuse for retaliatory measures of some kind. A small nation like Canada must not reject overtures from a large one like the States.

Belligerent demagogues might make it a pretext for forcible annexation. But, say the free-traders, England would not allow any such proceeding. My answer is this: if the treaty is adopted before its expiration, England will have little reason to care what becomes of this country. For all practical purposes, Canada will be to England a separate, or part of a separate nation. Had there been no secession of the South, no war, no war debt or termination of the treaty of 1854, British influence and British manufactures would be nearly extinct here by this time.

The proposed treaty meets with about as much opposition in the States as Canada. This is accepted, by free-traders, as a proof that the treaty is advan-

West Virginia has the largest and most valuable body of timber of any State in the Union. Prof. Fontaine estimates that the area still covered by forests is between 9,000,000 and 10,000,000 acres, and that the value of the surplus exportable timber is fully \$75,000,000 as it stands in the forests. The oak, walnut, cherry, ash, poplar, maple, elm, sycamore, and locust attain a size there not surpassed on the American continent.

may become,  
The South was  
leman was the

particular manufacture is justified in adopting protection for a time to give the start which otherwise individual enterprise alone would not be able to make."

"The start" above referred to is all that Canadian manufacturers ask. But free-traders are too cosmopolitan in their ideas to give their own countrymen even this small preference over foreigners. They contend that if a country has natural facilities its manufactures need no start. Mill thinks otherwise; he recommends protection *for a time*, even where the facilities exist.

FENELON FALLS.

W. DEWART.

---

Letter 9.

"A MARKET OF FORTY MILLIONS."

*From the CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS, Jan. 9, 1875.*

The foregoing quotation is one of the cunningly devised fallacies of free-traders in behalf of Reciprocity. It would be to the States, in many respects, a market of four millions, but never to Canada "a market of forty." In proportion to the population, the Americans are our customers to a limited extent, but our competitors to a large extent. The same rule holds good regarding their trade with England; while becoming less valuable customers, they are becoming more formidable competitors.

As shown by Mr. Mathews, in his work on "Imperial Federation," the imports of the States, from England, have been decreasing ever since their independence. While colonists they imported goods to the amount of £1 per head per annum; immediately after independence the rate declined to 16s. per head per annum; and in 1861 it was no more than 5s. 9d. per head per annum. This change was affected by the adoption of a protectionist policy after separation. American manufacturers have now not only excluded English goods, in a great measure, from their markets, but are supplying Canada with many articles formerly imported from England. Had the American manufacturers not been protected thus they could never have attained this position. Protection has made them the most formidable rivals England has, or is likely to have, in the future. It is only by accepting a theory without examining the facts, that a person can arrive at a different conclusion from the above.

To the States bordering on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence our exports may be considerable, but to the *great majority of the forty millions* we would never sell an article, for the simple reason that they produce and manufacture the same kind of commodities as we do. What do the Southern States want of Canada? They don't want our manufactures, because they can be supplied more cheaply and conveniently by the intervening States. It is not possible that they can become great customers of ours.

They don't want our lumber. There is more and better lumber in the Southern States than there is in Quebec or Ontario. It is distance, absence of railways, canals and navigable rivers which prevent the Eastern States from getting Southern lumber now. The unsettled state of the country is retarding the construction of railways and canals. The rivers run in the wrong direction

for the  
Canada  
settled  
ideal

clear  
and y  
human  
Quebe  
for C  
import  
Michi

suppl  
Lawr  
It is  
Amer  
fall in  
is eas  
an ult

F  
comes  
they  
or hav  
wheat  
export  
for a  
than  
himse  
to a m  
direct  
profit  
secure

T  
direct  
an en  
Canad  
of 18  
seced  
secess

from  
the te  
Here  
withd  
is ob  
meas  
from

But,  
answ  
little  
Can  
been  
of 18  
by th

Can



**WART.**

The proposed treaty meets with about as much opposition in the States as Canada. This is accepted, by free-traders, as a proof that the treaty is advan-

number in the  
ce, absence of  
n States from  
y is retarding  
ong direction

tageous to us. It is no proof at all. The treaty might be a positive injury to both countries. If A says to B, do my work and I will do yours, the proposition, if carried into effect, might result in large loss to both. This is just my view of the treaty. It might be injurious to both countries. Hence the opposition from both sides.

W. DEWART.

FENELON FALLS.

---

Letter 10.

*From the CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS, March 6, 1875.*

RECIPROCITY.—Reciprocity being rejected by the United States Senate, it may be thought by some that further discussion on the subject is unnecessary. Reciprocity is not, however, a dead issue. The question is sure to come up again. It may be our *turn* to reject it the next time, and public opinion requires to be ready for the event. Free Trade policy is to let the question alone at present; Protectionists policy is to keep it agitated. If carried at all, Reciprocity must be introduced and passed in haste. There is no doubt, therefore, that the Free Trade party will remain quite for a while, eagerly watching opportunities for future negotiation. Theirs is a policy of *surprise*. Mr. Brown's mission to Washington was a surprise to the public. His party had always maintained that Canada should not be the first to open negotiations on the subject.

However, following the example of the Liberals in England, whose example they seem anxious to follow in all things, they embraced the first chance of attempting to pass a free-trade treaty by *surprise*. Even where Acts are good in themselves, this principle of surprise is wrong. Politics should be public and deliberate. Acts affecting the public should be done openly and after full deliberation. The storming parties have been repulsed, but the siege has not been yet raised. The Free Traders will renew their assaults and *surprises* at no distant day. Protectionists, now is your time for sorties. Put the besiegers to flight. While they are unable to attack you is the time to attack them. In every age there is a liberal hobby. Free Trade is the hobby now. The leaders are a kind of enthusiasts. They have unbounded faith in their theories. They need no one to proclaim them infallible. They proclaim their own infallibility. They are men of few ideas. These ideas being once attained, they have to "step down and out," as Mr. Beecher would say. See Mr. Bright and Mr. Gladstone, for example. As soon as they cease to raise "burning questions," they lose their influence over the masses. Does it pay a nation to be agitated by "burning questions" all the time, in order that certain men may rule? The effect is obvious. The nation has little confidence in such men after all. Though it allows them to storm the works, it does not give them the fort when won. They are accounted active, but not steady.

Hence, whatever credit they derive for enlarging human liberty, the preservation of liberty is intrusted to others. Mr. Vernon Harcourt, in touching on this subject, supplies us with the best definition I have heard—"parties of sensation and politics of surprise." Radicalism is its own worst enemy. We have hardly any Reform Government, properly called. We have Radical

govern  
"burn  
It  
proci  
terms  
after s  
and m  
into so  
mome  
doubt  
one jo  
own w  
tively  
shift t  
but we

T  
than  
becom  
dignit  
Canad

T  
arrive  
no con  
again  
and o  
threat  
interc  
the U  
or pr  
opini  
nation  
are b  
inter  
South  
neigh  
Texas  
comm  
compl  
of the  
Union  
count  
the S  
quant  
tion.  
formi

N  
that F

governments much oftener. These hold office just as long as they can stir up "burning questions" to divert public attention from other defects.

It is curious how some journals, once delighted with the prospect of Reciprocity, have changed their tune. It cannot be on account of the terms. The terms were the same at first as last. But the contempt of the American Senate, after such humiliating concessions by this country, has "raised their dander," and made them quite national. After leading the Canadian Free Trade party into so bad a trap, it seems ungrateful of the Senate to desert it at the last moment. The terms were almost as good as annexation. After this, it is doubtful if the Americans would admit us into the Union without a *bonus*. Says one journal: "Nothing now remains to us but to shape our own policy in our own way. Since it cannot be, in any degree, North American, it must be distinctively Canadian." This was the proper course from the first. "We cannot shift the wind," the opinions or prejudices of foreign governments, or people; but we can "shift the sail," "shape our own policy in our own way."

The "almighty dollar" is said to govern the States, but something more than dollars entered into their calculations in this case. Canada offered to become annexed in almost everything except the name; but, understanding their dignity, they agreed among themselves to forego these advantages, and thus treat Canada with contempt.

The time has not yet arrived to get good terms from the States. It may not arrive for a generation. It will be brought about by events over which we have no control. One of these events may occur at any time. Should a civil war again arise; should the South or West secede, then our friendship, our neutrality, and our trade will be appreciated. The Eastern and Northern States are threatened both by the South and West. Should splits of this kind occur, our intercourse with the Eastern States may become intimate and profitable. As the Union stands at present there is little chance of either an honourable or profitable treaty. If we ever get Reciprocity on a fair basis, in my opinion, it will be with the Eastern and Northwestern States as a separate nation. These States and Canada have many interest in common. They are bound together by the great lakes and the St. Lawrence. They are interested in each other as neighbours. But the other sections, namely: the South and Far-West, while filled with all the prejudices of foreigners, have no neighbourly sympathies for us at all. What sympathy have we for Mexico? Texas or California cannot have more for us. Besides, there is a great contest commencing between civilization and barbarism. The heathen Chinese will complete the degradation begun by universal suffrage and the enfranchisement of the negroes. Not all the religious, intellectual, and moral agencies in the Union can civilize the huge stream of Chinese immigration pouring into the country. The Goths did not give Italy more trouble than the Chinese may give the States. Immigration is overdone. Too much attention is paid to the quantity and too little to the quality. There is too much undesirable immigration. They invite the refuse of all countries, thinking to make themselves formidable among nations. That refuse has become formidable to themselves.

W. DEWART.

FENELON FALLS.

---

NOTE.—Since writing the foregoing letters, especially those in 1874, I have come to the conclusion that Free-Trade does not suit even in England.

"Radicalism, whatever they may pretend," said a friend to M. Thiers, recently, "has no real root in the country, and if, which God forbid, it should ever attain power"—  
 "Then," replied M. Thiers, "it wouldn't last long, for in politics as in grammar the radical is always near the termination."

# BOARD OF TRADE RETURNS.

A Board of Trade returns for Decr on the 8th inst, and the results

40

## Letter 11.

### ENGLAND'S FOREIGN TRADE.

From the CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS.

The bad effects of Free-Trade on England's commerce is past concealment. The harvest of her foreign trade is evidently over. Free-traders can no longer mislead public opinion with regard to the present depression. The Board of Trade returns for October are about the worst ever issued. England has deluged the world with her manufactures, and the cause of her depression is that the demand for them is on the decline. This decline is not a temporary thing, either. English capital and labour have been largely diverted into unproductive channels by the advocacy of Free-Trade principles. England will, in the end, pay dear for any temporary advantages derived from it. Free-Trade in England is not only the cause of depression there, but of the depression which now exists in many other countries. The *London Telegraph* says the case is "of a nature to make the most determined optimist admit the fact of declining commerce and industry." Her exports were less in 1874 than 1873, and less in 1875 than 1874.

England has invested enormous sums in ships and factories, but the factories are nearly idle and the ships have little to do; but the people want bread, and those who have bread want little, if any, of her manufactures, so the bread has to be paid for with gold. The product of English capital and labour is depreciating. This is what is the matter with England. *She has been producing articles for which an effective profitable demand has nearly ceased.* England gained a temporary advantage by having these things in advance of other nations, but the advantage is ceasing. The silk manufacturers were ruined by Free-Trade, and the machinery for that purpose became of little value. The manufacture of glass is also nearly driven from the country. American cotton manufacturers are even now sending cotton to England. English manufacturers cannot continue to import raw cotton and export manufactured cotton back to compete with American manufacturers in their own market. Hence a great part of the fixed capital of English manufacturers will be rendered unproductive.

England has great facilities for manufacturing, but trade being gone, the capital expended in creating these will be partially wasted. The time is coming when English manufacturers will be able to do no more than hold their home market in cotton goods. This will render a great deal of machinery unproductive; and many ships now employed in the cotton trade will have to find other employment. Her woollen manufactures will probably hold out longer. She is a great wool producing country; but other countries are also becoming great wool producers, and so soon as they become able to manufacture their own wool they will need English goods no longer. Canada is importing less woollen goods every year. Our own manufacturers are rapidly superseding all others, notwithstanding all the disadvantages under which they are placed. The one thing which gives them the advantage is their better judgment regarding the class of goods required. Great fears are entertained about the coal mines of England becoming exhausted; but there is a much more immediate danger than this. The foreign demand for English goods will cease long before her supply of coal.

The abolition of the Corn Laws was part of the Free-Trade policy. It was opposed by the nobility, though it was the one thing which has prevented reforms in the tenure of land. *Had the Corn Laws not been abolished, all or nearly all the large estates would have been divided up, sold, and under cultivation now. This is what would have been done to keep down the price of food.* Laws would have been passed allowing the partition and sale of entailed estates. Food might not have risen much in price, for more land would have been cultivated.

B  
 lish fa  
 Thus  
 great c  
 tion to  
 agricu  
 her pe  
 T  
 people  
 35,264  
 used to  
 ments  
 and on  
 32,324  
 buildin  
 this a  
 Well,  
 there  
 2,664,  
 ance  
 cultiva  
 agricu  
 that in  
 three  
 from t  
 and W  
 Ireland  
 land, 1  
 from  
 land i  
 manuf  
 from  
 labour  
 merch  
 would  
 refine  
 mainl  
 one, i  
 distrib  
 of soc  
 undiv  
 raised  
 rong  
 own  
 when  
 T  
 prese  
 custo  
 becom  
 trade  
 T  
 Engl  
 likely  
 foreig  
 factu  
 powe  
 impo  
 time.

But the importation of cheap food rendered agriculture unnecessary. English farms were depreciated in value by competition with cheap lands everywhere. *Thus Free-Trade in corn has prevented Free-Trade in land.* This caused a great emigration of agricultural labourers. This emigration was just in proportion to the imports of food. England's farms are in foreign countries, and her agricultural labourers have had to go to them. Had her farms been at home, her people might also have stayed at home.

The question therefore is—does England contain enough land to feed all her people. I think there is enough, or nearly. England and Wales contain 55,264,000 acres of land. Out of this there are 31,000,000 fit for cultivation. It used to be reckoned that one-eighth was unfit for cultivation. But recent experiments in pumping and draining marshes have reduced this proportion materially, and one-twelfth would now be nearer the mark. This, therefore, would leave 32,324,334 acres fit for cultivation. But, then, there is the land occupied by buildings, roads, and railways. Allow 1,325,334 acres for these, though I consider this an excessive estimate, being over twenty-six times the area of London. Well, now, what proportion of this land is cultivated? In England and Wales there were this year 3,342,388 acres of wheat, 2,509,598 acres of barley, and 2,664,048 acres of oats. These are the principal crops, and, making due allowance for all other crops, it is evident that between the land that is partially cultivated and that which is uncultivated there is room for a vast extension of agriculture. In his *Principles of Political Economy*, page 166, J. S. Mill shows that in Flanders two and a half acres of land raise food for a man, his wife, and three children. He also shows that this is inferior sandy soil, originally reclaimed from the sea, not to be compared with land in England. At this rate, England and Wales have land enough to feed sixty-two millions of people. If we include Ireland and Scotland, where there is a much larger proportion of uncultivated land, it will make my argument much stronger. Thus England is drawing food from the ends of the earth, often at famine prices, while the best agricultural land in the world is lying waste at home. And the labour expended on the manufactures exchanged for this far exceeds the labour required to extract it from her own soil. To this extent, therefore, Free-Trade has diverted English labour into unprofitable channels. If one-third of the capital invested in merchants' ships and manufacturing machinery was employed in agriculture, it would cause a much larger and better distribution of wealth and comfort and refinement than at present. England's wealth is badly distributed, and this is mainly due to Free-Trade. There is no nation in the world, there never was one, in which the distribution of wealth was more unequal. And this unequal distribution is one of the great questions of the day, and one of the great dangers of society. By discouraging agriculture, Free-Trade has kept the large estates undivided and perpetuated the rule of the aristocracy, and in commerce it has raised up a class of merchant princes and manufacturers. It did the same thing, long ago, in Rome. After the people admitted corn free, and neglected their own agriculture, the inequality of wealth increased steadily. The time is near when men will cease to point to England in vindication of Free-Trade principles.

The *New York Shipping List*, a very ably conducted journal, alludes to the present depression in the following terms: "Many of England's best foreign customers for iron, coal, machinery, and various manufactures, are said to have become independent of her." Are the ships and machinery employed in foreign trade worth as much as her land would be if cultivated? I think not.

There are two causes which may lead to the extension of agriculture in England. One is a duty on corn as formerly. This is not likely. It is more likely to result from a decreasing foreign demand for English goods. Some foreign manufacturers are now not only underselling but excelling English manufacturers in the quality of their goods. This being the case, the purchasing power of English manufactures is becoming inadequate to supply the nation with imported food. Its manufactures are not purchasing its breadstuffs at the present time. For the last few years, large balances have had to be paid for in gold.

This is what bankers call a foreign drain. A rise in the rate of "the Bank of England is the expedient used to check a foreign drain. It checks the exportation of money. It means this, "If you leave your money with us a while longer you may have higher interest." These factories and their products will depreciate in value, and what should have been done at first will have to be done at last, namely, develop the agricultural resources of the country.

England protected her manufactures till they became developed. This was right. But she withdrew all protection from agriculture. This was wrong. Her manufactures are now a drug in the market, while she pays the highest prices in the world for food. Thus we see she buys dear and sells cheap. This is burning the candle at both ends. She can do this at present just because London is the great money market of the world. Money is sent to London from all parts of the world for investment. Hence there is always a great floating capital there. This deceives people. The capital is always there, but it is not the same capital, and it is not all owned there. This is more particularly the case since the late French and German war. Before that time Paris was a great money market. The German Government has large sums of money in London. Nearly all the French indemnity was paid in London, and a great part is still there. It is this floating capital that enables England to go on, year after year, importing food and paying for a great part of it in gold. England, with all her ships and factories, should be able to pay for her food with her manufactures, and that she cannot do so proves that her labour is unproductive. Free-Trade is the cause.

If the demand for English manufactures was not on the decline, it might be safe to go on depending on imported food. But, as I have shown, England's best customers for coal, iron, machinery, and other goods, are now nearly independent of her. To hold her trade in future, wages will have to come down; and reduced wages means diminished comforts for her labouring classes. The real problem is, how will the price of wages come down while the price of food goes on increasing, as it is sure to do while the greater part of it has to be imported. Free-Trade was intended to elevate the labourer, but for the foregoing reasons it is sure to injure him.

I have said that England does not produce near all her own food, and that from the diminishing demand for her manufactures they have become insufficient to purchase it. Now, it remains to be shown how England pays for the excess of imports over exports. London is the world's banker. For example, it is said that Brigham Young has nine million dollars there on deposit. From all parts of the world money is sent to London. It is curious that money should be sent from countries where interest is high to a country where interest is low; but it is the case, nevertheless. This is the reason. One can get more money in London on demand than in any other place, because the bank that has the largest deposits can furnish the largest loans on call. It need not be the bank that has the largest capital of its own, either. English bankers lend these deposits to the British Government, to foreign governments, and to all parts of the world; and *it is out of its profits as a banker in this way that it pays for the excess of imports over exports.*

Suppose, for example, that Brigham Young has nine million dollars on deposit with some English bankers. This may be part of the money which is paying for the Suez Canal.

Whatever England makes in this way by being the world's banker, we know that her losses are also enormous. Take the Turkish bondholders, for example. It is not long since an association of foreign bondholders was formed, and the published statement revealed enormous losses. As I have shown, these losses are not all out of English capital. As yet, it is foreigners that are defaulters to English capitalists, but if the losses continue, English capitalists may yet become defaulters to foreign depositors. It is impossible to determine England's financial standing. As yet, she is the world's banker, and handles much more money than any other nation; but if a bank's deposits are numerous enough and large enough, it can go on doing business long after its own capital is all gone. Free-

Trade i  
has dis  
These h  
to fall  
A great  
break u  
her in t  
importa  
which s  
importe  
was en  
English  
refuse  
to sup  
neglect  
foreign

E.  
scale,  
station  
the wo  
ports.  
Englis  
countr  
Alaba  
ships  
of Egy  
manuf  
matter  
by the  
by Fr  
unles  
tectio

"The  
losing  
But "  
it mu

to co  
which  
as su

striv

come  
creat

other  
for h  
prod  
midd  
Whe  
that

gros  
agri

but



the Bank of  
the exporta-  
while longer  
depreciate  
ne at last,

This was  
ong. Her  
st prices in  
is burning  
ndon is the  
all parts of  
pital there.  
me capital,  
the late  
ey market.  
rly all the

It is this  
orting food  
and facto-  
nd that she  
ne cause.

t might be  
England's  
early inde-  
ome down ;  
sses. The  
ce of food  
has to be  
r the fore-

, and that  
insufficient  
ne excess of  
it is said  
all parts  
ld be sent  
; but it is  
in London  
he largest  
t that has  
sits to the  
orld ; and  
of imports

on deposit  
paying for

we know  
example.  
and the  
ese losses  
aulters to  
et become  
s finan-  
re money  
and large  
e. Free-

Trade is likely to turn out a very unprofitable experiment for England. England has discouraged her agriculture, and turned most of her labour to manufactures. These have so depreciated in value as not to purchase food enough, and she has to fall back on the precarious profits of banking to make up the deficiency. A great war might, and probably would, deprive England of this business, and break up this centre of capital, or transfer it to some other place. It would hurt her in two ways. First, it would make food scarce and dear by interrupting its importation. Secondly, it would deprive her of her banking business, out of which she now makes much of the money with which she pays for the food imported. This is a very sensitive and artificial state of industry. If England was engaged in a great war, capitalists would not have the same confidence in English bankers that they have now. But war is a thing which free-traders refuse to consider in questions of this kind. They tell us that arbitration is going to supersede war in future. It is, however, my opinion that the nations which neglect to consider this question will soon have to consider the questions of foreign intervention and servitude.

England is protecting her manufacturers, all the time, on a most gigantic scale, though free-traders do not appear to know it. She is keeping up naval stations out of the public purse to keep the way open for manufactures all over the world. She goes to war with China, and compels that nation to open her ports. She keeps an army in India to protect her trade. If India afforded English manufacturers no market, would the Government risk a war for that country? If it is not for its trade, India is of no use to England. She paid the Alabama claims for the privilege of allowing her people to sell the Southerner ships and munitions of war during the rebellion. She has just paid the Khedive of Egypt twenty millions of dollars for the Suez Canal, to keep the way for her manufactures open to the East. *This is protection to home manufactures, no matter under what name it goes.* But it is a kind of protection rendered necessary by the evil effects of Free-Trade. The misapplication of English labour, caused by Free-Trade, has created a vast amount of fixed capital, which must be wasted unless things like these are done ; and, no matter whether free-traders or protectionists rule, this policy is now forced upon them.

The London correspondent of the *Globe* says with regard to the Suez Canal. "The bargain is a wise one, whatever may happen, though, pecuniarily, it is a losing transaction. We shall lose the interest of £4,000,000 for some forty years." But "so important is the friendliness of Egypt to us that, no matter at what cost, it must be secured."

Now, England is paying all this to protect her manufactures. She has ceased to confine the circle to her own shores, but there is, nevertheless, a circle within which she employs protective measures. She is paying for this protection just as surely as when she levied duties on imports.

The time it paid England to protect her manufacturers was while they were striving to supply the home market.

*When the manufacturers become able to hold the home market against all comers, they need, and ought to have, no more protection. Further protection only creates an artificial state of industry.*

Measured in labour, England is paying much higher prices for food than any other nation ; and, measured by the same rule, she is getting much lower prices for her manufactures. This is the reason. Food is nowhere so cheap as where producers and consumers deal direct. But England is fed by a lot of dealers and middlemen. Thus the people pay dear for food and get little for manufactures. When we add the losses arising from bad debts on goods exported, it is apparent that great quantities of labour go for small quantities of food.

The net cash proceeds of her exports do not buy near so much food as the gross cash value of those exports would take out of her own soil, if employed in agriculture.

When one subject cheats another, it is an individual but not a national loss ; but where a foreign merchant cheats a British manufacturer, it is both an indi-

*Protection is a shield. Its use is not to wound or hurt but to ward off.*

44

victual and national loss. It diminishes the annual value of the land and labour of a country to that extent.

What England has to sell is now nearly always a drug in the market, and what she wants to buy is a prime necessary of life. It is bad to be depending on foreign manufactures, but worse to be dependent on foreign food.

And no nation in the world can adopt Free-Trade without soon becoming dependent on one or other of these.

The price of food rises much faster than the price of manufactures when there is any fear of a scarcity.

When one goes to buy manufactured goods he can wait and higgie without serious danger, but when a scarcity of food is feared, produce dealers have to bid the prices at once that will fetch it.

*It is as wrong to import food, that may be advantageously produced at home, as manufactures; it is as wrong to crush home agriculture as home manufactures. In England, Free-Trade crushes agriculture; in Canada, it would crush manufactures.* This shows it doesn't suit in either place.

In France, agriculture and manufactures run in parallel lines, as it were. Both are equally protected. The consequence is that France is one of the greatest wheat growing countries in the world, and an exporter of food as well as manufactures. Her protection to agriculture has led to the partition, sale and cultivation of all the large estates, till there are now six millions of land owners in France. French economy would receive more notice if French politics were more settled. But, well or ill governed, France's wealth increases enormously. At the end of the late war the greatest financiers of the world had no conception of her resources, and she is recovering strength at a rate that no other nation could, and this is because her industry is protective. France has few drugs in the market. There is a market for all, and a profit on all her products.

FENELON FALLS, ONT.

W. DEWART.

on the  
once t  
as

we are now than  
ago. Then the debt was  
one-third of the whole property in  
as its security; now it is  
Daily Mail Feb 16  
1878

and labour  
market, and  
ending on

becoming

then there

without  
ive to bid

at home,  
ufactures.  
h manu-

it were.  
e greatest  
as manu-  
d cultiva-  
owners in  
ere more  
. At the  
n of her  
on could,  
gs in the

RT.

han  
lebt w  
property m  
w it is o  
Feb 16  
1878